

Message Text

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 STATE 118066

11

ORIGIN EUR-12

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-03 INR-07 L-02 ACDA-05

NSAE-00 PA-01 PRS-01 SP-02 USIA-06 TRSE-00 SAJ-01

DODE-00 /041 R

DRAFTED BY EUR/RPM:COL. RTHOMPSON:MEM

APPROVED BY EUR:RDVINE

OASD/ISA:MG MCAULIFFE

MBFR TF:MR. CLARKE

JCS/J-5:COL. RENKEN (INFO)

EUR/CAN:DAKRUSE

PM/ISP:JGRAHAM

EUR/RPM:VLEHOVICH/HAHOLMES

----- 118315

P R 202309Z MAY 75

FM SECSTATE WASHDC

TO AMEMBASSY OTTAWA PRIORITY

USMISSION NATO

INFO USDEL MBFR VIENNA

USCINCEUR

C O N F I D E N T I A L STATE 118066

E.O. 11652:GDS

TAGS: MPOL, NATO, CA

SUBJECT: CANADIAN DEFENSE REVIEW

REFS: A. OTTAWA 1793; B. USNATO 2682; C. OTTAWA 1766;
D. OTTAWA 1757

1. OVER PAST YEAR BOTH THE NETHERLANDS AND UK COMPLETED
EXTENSIVE DEFENSE REVIEWS. BOTH COUNTRIES CONSULTED WITH
NATO AND TOOK ALLIED VIEWS INTO ACCOUNT BEFORE MAKING
FINAL DECISIONS. IN CASE OF UK, THE GOVERNMENT SUBMITTED
RESULTS OF DEFENSE REVIEW TO DPC AND MILITARY COMMITTEE AS
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 STATE 118066

PROPOSALS OR PROVISIONAL CONCLUSIONS AND ALLOWED NATO

AUTHORITIES TWO MONTHS TO STUDY THE PROPOSALS AND GIVE THEIR COMMENTS. (FYI. UK CONSULTED BILATERALLY WITH US BEFORE OPENING CONSULTATIONS WITH NATO. END FYI.) UK GOVERNMENT THEN MODIFIED ITS PROPOSALS IN LIGHT OF NATO VIEWS AND ANNOUNCED ITS DECISIONS IN WHITE PAPER PUBLISHED MARCH 19, 1975.

2. IN 1968 NATO GOVERNMENTS AFFIRMED THE PROPOSITION THAT THE OVERALL MILITARY CAPABILITY OF NATO SHOULD NOT BE REDUCED EXCEPT AS PART OF A PATTERN OF MUTUAL FORCE REDUCTIONS BALANCED IN SCOPE AND TIMING. IN THEIR DEFENSE REVIEWS, BOTH UK AND NETHERLANDS ALSO TOOK INTO ACCOUNT

AGREED NATO POLICY OPPOSING ANY UNILATERAL REDUCTIONS IN GROUND FORCES MANPOWER IN NATO GUIDELINES AREA (NGA) EXCEPT IN THE CONTEXT OF MBFR.

3. AT UPCOMING NATO MEETINGS, WE INTEND TO REAFFIRM THE IMPORTANCE OF THESE PRINCIPLES AND ENDORSE EARLY CONSULTATIONS ON ANY CHANGES IN FORCES COMMITTED TO NATO. THESE ARE IMPORTANT PRINCIPLES WHICH WE INTEND TO FOLLOW AND WHICH WE BELIEVE SHOULD APPLY TO ALL ALLIES, WHETHER THEIR FORCE COMMITMENTS ARE LARGE OR SMALL. WE INTEND TO ENCOURAGE COUNTRIES WHO HAVE ANNOUNCED DEFENSE REVIEWS TO ABIDE BY THESE PRINCIPLES.

4. WE BELIEVE OUR POSITION ON THESE MATTERS IS SHARED BY GOC. AS COUNTRY WHOSE DEFENSE REVIEW IS RECEIVING CURRENT RECENT PUBLICITY, WE HOPE GOC WILL FIND OCCASION DURING COMING MEETINGS TO REAFFIRM SUPPORT FOR PRINCIPLE OF CONSULTATION AND PRINCIPLES MENTIONED ABOVE. SUCH A STATEMENT WOULD ALSO BE ADDITIONAL HELPFUL PRECEDENT FOR COUNTRIES LIKE NORWAY AND ITALY WHICH ARE JUST BEGINNING REVIEW PROCESS.

5. FOR OTTAWA. YOU SHOULD APPROACH GOC AT APPROPRIATE LEVEL AND, DRAWING ON ABOVE POINTS, SEEK ITS AGREEMENT TO CONSULT ALONG LINES OF UK EXAMPLE AND MARSHALL COMMENTS PARA 4 REFTEL A. AS YOU MAKE POINTS ON NATO CONSULTATION, YOU SHOULD ALSO STRESS THAT USG EXPECTS CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 STATE 118066

PRIOR CONSULTATION ON ANY MATTER INVOLVED IN GOC DEFENSE REVIEW WHICH TOUCHES ON BILATERAL DEFENSE ARRANGEMENT WITH US. SUCH BILATERAL MATTERS MIGHT BE MOST APPROPRIATELY COVERED IN PJBD FORUM.

6. FOR USNATO. YOU SHOULD INFORM CANADIAN DELEGATION OF ABOVE VIEWS AFTER EMBASSY OTTAWA HAS COMMUNICATED THEM TO GOC. YOU MAY WISH TO ENCOURAGE OTHER DELEGATIONS, AS

APPROPRIATE, TO MAKE SIMILAR REPRESENTATIONS, BOTH IN BRUSSELS AND IN OTTAWA.

7. FYI. WE BELIEVE IT WOULD BE INAPPROPRIATE FOR US TO INDICATE A PREFERENCE FOR ONE OPTION OVER ANOTHER WHILE CANADIAN DEFENSE REVIEW IS IN PROGRESS AND BEFORE ITS FINDINGS HAVE BEEN SENT TO CABINET FOR CONSIDERATION. WE FEEL STRONGLY, HOWEVER, THAT GOC SHOULD CONSULT FULLY WITH US AND NATO BEFORE REACHING ANY FINAL DECISIONS AFFECTING BILATERAL ARRANGEMENTS WITH US OR INTERESTS OF ALLIES IN EUROPE. OUR OPPOSITION TO UNILATERAL MANPOWER CUTS IN NGA IS, IN EFFECT, A REJECTION OF ALL-AIR OPTION, SINCE MANPOWER REDUCTION ALMOST INEVITABLE UNDER THIS OPTION. BILATERAL MEETING BETWEEN SECDEF AND

MOD RICHARDSON MAY BE ARRANGED DURING DPC, IN WHICH CASE WE WILL PROPOSE SECDEF RAISE SOME OF ABOVE POINTS, INCLUDING MATTER OF CONSULTATION.

INGERSOLL

CONFIDENTIAL

NNN

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 01 JAN 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: ALLIANCE, INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS, INTERNATIONAL PEACEKEEPING FORCES
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 20 MAY 1975
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: CunninFX
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1975STATE118066
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: COL. RTHOMPSON:MEM
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: GS
Errors: N/A
Film Number: D750177-1032
From: STATE
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1975/newtext/t19750534/aaaabelp.tel
Line Count: 135
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM
Office: ORIGIN EUR
Original Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 3
Previous Channel Indicators: n/a
Previous Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: 75 OTTAWA 1793, 75 USNATO 2682, 75 OTTAWA 1766
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: CunninFX
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 08 APR 2003
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <08 APR 2003 by ShawDG>; APPROVED <16 SEP 2003 by CunninFX>
Review Markings:

Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
05 JUL 2006

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: CANADIAN DEFENSE REVIEW
TAGS: MPOL, CA, NATO
To: OTTAWA NATO BRUSSELS
Type: TE
Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 05 JUL 2006